

REMARKS

The assertion that Talluri teaches the limitations of using different error resilience techniques and applying resynchronization markers at different intervals is unsupported. In fact, there is no discussion of separate intervals. The same resynchronization markers are cited in two different places in the specification in Talluri to suggest two different sets of resynchronization markers at two different intervals. There is no support for two different resynchronization markers, nor for two different intervals. The slice function resynchronization marker is referred to in column 3 is the same slice start codes referred to in column 2. There are no different resynchronization markers at different intervals.

Moreover, the assertion that the second error resilience technique replaces a bit pattern for the second type of frame with a bit pattern of shorter length seems to be unsupported. Nothing in any of the cited material in any way supports the argument.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

New claims 34 *et seq.* are method claims corresponding to the claims indicated to be allowable by the Board.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: May 22, 2006

Timothy N. Trop
Registration No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation